UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/570,831	02/05/2007	Kevin N. Taylor	007412.00104	8780
71867 BANNER & W	7590 05/24/201 TTCOFF , LTD	EXAMINER		
ATTORNEYS :	FOR CLIENT NUMB	ZHOU, YONG		
1100 13th STREET, N.W. SUITE 1200			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTO	N, DC 20005-4051	2477		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/24/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/570,831	TAYLOR ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	TONG ZHOO	2477	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>10 May 2011</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPI	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appelor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, wwith 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b), ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE r).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FI	on. LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extra under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>			
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, the contract of the cont	nsideration and/or search (see NO		cause
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better appeal; and/or	,		ne issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		bi a lo c 611 a al a una a un alum a c	
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [_
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		n be entered and an e	хріапацоп от
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-35</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	t does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	Nona Zhou!		
	/Yong Zhou/ Primary Examiner, Art U	Init 2477	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Regarding amended claim 1, Applicant argues that none of the references of record disclose or suggest the feature of "wherein each channel information message identifies at least a portion of the network addresses associated with the one or more tunnels provided by the information distribution system and includes a listing of tunnel types and a listing of tunnel type identifiers for differentiating between different tunnels identified with a same tunnel type". In particular, Applicant argues that Shahar does not disclose or suggest the word "tunnel," tunnel type," and/or tunnel type identifier." In response, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Shahar teaches that a wireless modem termination system (WMTS, a wireless hub) sends DCD messages to wireless modems (CPEs) over a network over downstream channels; the DCD message defines all downstream channels utilized by the WMTS (wireless hub), the DCD message includes a list of channel type and channel identifiers for downstream channels (Fig, 2, #100-114, col. 3, lines 17-21, col. 4, lines 62-65, col., 6, lines 45-62, Tables 3 & 6). The claimed "tunnel" has been interpreted as a connection/channel that the CPE modem tunes to and receives data over. The "channel" taught in Shahar refers the same thing (see col. 11, lines 23-27). Thus, in light of the claim language, the combination of Chapman'515 and Shahar meets the claim requirements.

Newly added claims 32-35 on the DCD message would be rejected the same as presented in the previous Office action. Therefore, the arguments provided by Applicant after the prosecution on the merit is closed do not render the claims allowable...